

# **The United States Senate**

---

## **Report of Proceedings**

---

### **Hearing held before**

**Special Preparedness Subcommittee  
of the Committee on Armed Services**

### **MILITARY COLD WAR EDUCATION AND SPEECH REVIEW POLICIES**

---

**Thursday, April 5, 1962**

**Washington, D. C.**

---

**WARD & PAUL**

**1760 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N. W.  
WASHINGTON, D. C.**

---

**SPECIAL PREPAREDNESS SUBCOMMITTEE  
OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**

**JOHN STENNIS, Mississippi, Chairman**

<b>STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri</b>	<b>LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Massachusetts</b>
<b>HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington</b>	<b>MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Maine</b>
<b>STROM THURMOND, South Carolina</b>	<b>FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota</b>
<b>E. L. BARTLETT, Alaska</b>	

**JAMES T. KENDALL, Chief Counsel**

C O N T E N T STESTIMONY OF:PAGE

Edwin A. Walker

Accompanied by:

Medford Evans,

Consultant;

-and-

Clyde J. Watts,

Counsel (Looney, Watts, Looney, Nichols &  
Johnson, Esqs.) -- resumed

2677

Pages at which material is to be inserted :

2733

TD

MILITARY COLD WAR EDUCATION AND  
SPEECH REVIEW POLICIES

- - -

Thursday, April 5, 1962

United States Senate,  
Special Preparedness Subcommittee  
of the Committee on Armed Services,  
Washington, D. C.

The Special Subcommittee met, pursuant to recess, at  
10:00 o'clock a.m., in Room 318, Old Senate Office Building,  
Senator John Stennis (Chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Stennis (Chairman), Symington, Thurmond,  
Bartlett, and Saltonstall.

Also present: Senators Cannon and Beall of the Full Armed  
Services Committee.

Special Subcommittee Staff: James T. Kendall, Chief  
Counsel.

- - -

Senator Stennis (presiding). The Committee will come to order, please.

General Walker, are you ready to proceed?

TESTIMONY OF EDWIN A. WALKER

ACCOMPANIED BY:

MEDFORD EVANS, CONSULTANT;

AND

CLYDE J. WATTS, COUNSEL

(LOONEY, WATTS, LOONEY, NICHOLS & JOHNSON, ESQS.)

RESUMED

Mr. Walker. Yes, sir.

Senator Stennis. Gentlemen of the Committee, when we concluded last night, I believe that we had just had questions of Senator Thurmond and the Chairman was last, so that brings us back to Mr. Kendall.

Mr. Kendall, do you have additional questions?

Mr. Kendall. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Stennis. All right.

Will you proceed?

Mr. Kendall. General, I have a few questions for clarification.

I believe that you indicated that in the 1953 suit filed by the Overseas Weekly to enjoin the Defense Department from banning it, the court issued an order holding that the Defense Department did not have that authority.

Did I understand you correctly?

Mr. Walker. That the Defense Department did not have authority to ban the Overseas Weekly?

Mr. Kendall. Yes, sir.

Mr. Walker. I do not remember making such a statement, no, sir.

Mr. Kendall. What was it?

Mr. Walker. I referred to some form of litigation by the Overseas Weekly.

Mr. Kendall. Yes, sir, you did.

Mr. Walker. Which concluded in finding that the Overseas Weekly complaint did not justify placing it back on the newsstands, based on their complaint and legal action.

Mr. Kendall. Your information was that this was court action or a holding by the court?

Mr. Walker. OW sued to be restored to the stands, to the newsstands, and the Judge was a man by the name of Judge Tamm.

Mr. Kendall. The point I am getting to, General, this is just my information, that, of course, it would be important to us if the court had actually issued an order holding one way or the other.

My information was that the court did not ever actually act upon the complaint, but that the order was rescinded by Secretary of Defense Wilson without any court order.

Mr. Walker. The Judge ruled that by the OW's action, it could not force itself back on to the newsstands by this litigation.

Mr. Kendall. General, there is another point that I think the record needs clarification on.

I think I understood you correctly, and this is with respect to the authority of the commander to ban the distribution of a publication which he might consider morally objectionable or subversive, or objectionable or harmful on some other grounds. It is my understanding -- and I so understood you, but I think that there is some confusion about it in the record -- that there is a regulation which does give the commander such authority with respect to such publications.

Mr. Walker. Yes, sir, there is a regulation, and the number of it is A. R. 381-135, which authorizes taking off the newsstands literature which counters the necessary purposes and responsibilities of a commander.

It does not have to be subversive, and I would like to refer in much of this discussion that the word "subversive" does not necessarily have to apply to Communism, by any means, sir.

It can be subversive to American principles, efforts and responsibilities, particularly in the military service.

This Army Regulation authorizes the commander at any echelon to remove such a publication from the newsstand.

Mr. Kendall. And all the commander has to do is to take action and report it to a higher command, this is correct?

Mr. Walker. If he follows the Army Regulation, he would be obeying the Regulation and has that authority. But there are other things now that are superseding those regulations which I have explained.

Mr. Kendall. Yes, sir, but --

Mr. Walker. Evidently, which are hidden.

Mr. Kendall. Just a moment, General. Let me get this clarification for the record and then you, of course, can explain.

Mr. Walker. Right, sir.

Mr. Kendall. I am just trying to straighten out what, to me, was a confused situation.

Your position you have stated, as I understood you, that there was a Regulation that gave this authority, but in this particular situation what you were saying, that while you had the naked authority under the Regulation, that, because of certain forces, you did not actually have the power to act under the Regulation.

Is this what I understood you to say?

Mr. Walker. Because I had been informed that I could not ban it from the newsstands.

Mr. Kendall. Who informed you of this?

Mr. Walker. Through staff channels.



Mr. Kendall. Where did the information originate?

At what level and through which particular channel?

Did it come through Army channels directly, or did it come through Norstad's Command, for example?

Mr. Walker. It came through military channels. I do not know where it originates.

Mr. Kendall. So you do not know who actually sent you the word that you could not do it?

Mr. Walker. I could have identified the staff officers at one time or the commanders, but I cannot remember them now.

Mr. Kendall. You wanted to make some further --

Mr. Walker. I definitely had the word not to ban that paper.

Mr. Kendall. But you do not know from whom?

Mr. Walker. No, sir, just like we cannot find out who put it back on the stands and who is giving General Norstad the responsibility for keeping it there.

He has not a free decision to keep that paper on the news-stand.

Mr. Kendall. Do you know what channels it came through, General?

Mr. Walker. Military channels, sir.

Mr. Kendall. Which particular line?

Mr. Walker. By normal line from Army to Corps to myself, or direct from Army. There are two channels. One is administra-

tive and one is operation, and they overlap.

Mr. Kendall. So it came through Regular Army channels and not the European Command channels?

Mr. Walker. That is correct.

Mr. Kendall. Now, you wanted to make some other comment with reference to this matter and for the purposes of getting this clarification in I interrupted you, and I certainly will be glad to hear whatever you have to say on that point now.

Mr. Walker. Yes, sir.

I would like to add that I am not here to be investigated or to defend myself.

I am here to show why there is no adequate cold war indoctrination program in the Army, and, in my opinion, to include the military services.

I should like to clarify my own testimony and certain facts about The Taro Leaf, the ACA Index, and --

Mr. Kendall. Just a moment, General, this is not responsive to my question.

Senator Stennis. Just a moment, gentlemen.

The General wants to make a statement, you say, clarifying something about the ACA Index?

Mr. Walker. Right, sir.

Senator Stennis. Let it come now, that will be all right.

Mr. Walker. We will go ahead, sir.

Senator Stennis. All right, proceed with the questions.

Mr. Kendall. In view of what you said, I take it that you never actually imposed a ban on the distribution of the OW in the 24th Division?

Mr. Walker. That is correct.

I was denied the right to do so.

Mr. Kendall. I know that on May 26, 1961, and June 3, 1961, you made certain written recommendations that OW be barred from the Army newsstands, and that was after the completion of the investigation, of course.

Did you ever make such a written recommendation prior to, say, April 16, 1961?

Mr. Walker. I made an oral request before that it be banned.

I believe the one you refer to was written at Heidelberg May 26, 1961.

Is that correct?

Mr. Kendall. Yes, sir.

Mr. Walker. I had made several requests to ban the Overseas Weekly and had discussed the necessity and requirements of banning it, and the failure in responsibility was in command not to ban it.

Mr. Kendall. Was this in writing, General, prior to April, 1961, say?

Mr. Walker. There is no use following up something in writing when you have made an oral request in the United States

Army and you are told you cannot do it.

Mr. Kendall. General, I believe you testified yesterday that you had seen "Operation Abolition" and that you classified it as a good, hard-hitting information film?

Mr. Walker. That is correct, sir.

Mr. Kendall. What about "Communism on the Map," have you seen that; and, if so, how would you classify it?

Mr. Walker. I have not seen that film.

I would classify it also as a good, hard-hitting, anti-Communist film and one that is absolutely necessary in our training activities.

Mr. Kendall. You have not seen that?

Mr. Walker. No, I have not, sir.

Mr. Kendall. What about "Blueprint for Conquest," have you seen that?

Mr. Walker. I have not seen that, but I understand it is typical of the weakness in the program as initiated from the top.

Mr. Kendall. "Blueprint for Conquest"?

Mr. Walker. I missed the name of it. I may be referring to the wrong film. This name is what, sir?

Mr. Kendall. "Blueprint for Conquest".

Mr. Walker. I am sorry, we do not know anything about that film. My reference was to "Challenge of Ideas".

Mr. Kendall. This is the one that you testified yesterday

that you had not seen, but you thought it was entirely inadequate for a Troop Information Program?

Mr. Walker. This one?

Mr. Kendall. "Challenge of Ideas".

Mr. Walker. Yes, sir, "Challenge of Ideas".

Mr. Kendall. Now, what about the film, "Communist Target -- Youth"?

Have you seen that one? I will identify it.

Mr. Walker. I believe you can identify that further as an official film, is that correct?

Mr. Kendall. Official film recently issued by the Department of Defense, yes, sir.

Mr. Walker. I would be happy to use anything that comes from J. Edgar Hoover, I can assure you.

Mr. Kendall. This was a film released and prepared by the Department of Defense, General. Have you seen it?

Mr. Walker. No, I have not.

Mr. Kendall. How did you yesterday --

Mr. Walker. If the Department of Defense prepared it, I would still be skeptical of it.

Mr. Kendall. In other words, anything that the Department of Defense prepares, you would --

Mr. Walker. Under the present Training Program --

Mr. Kendall. Let me finish my question.

Mr. Walker. Yes, sir.

Senator Thurmond. Mr. Chairman, I think he is entitled to answer. He was cut off.

Senator Stennis. I think that we can take a little more time. Let us not have each one talk at the same time.

Mr. Walker. Sorry, sir, my mistake.

Senator Stennis. Those things often happen.

Mr. Kendall. Go ahead, General.

Mr. Walker. I am sorry, sir, will you repeat the question, Mr. Secretary Kendall?

Mr. Kendall. I was asking you:

Would you be skeptical of anything that was produced by the Department of Defense in Troop Training or Troop Information?

Mr. Walker. I would at the moment under the soft-line approach that is being used as the policy.

Mr. Kendall. How did you evaluate the series of pamphlets "Democracy vs. Communism" in your testimony yesterday?

Mr. Walker. As the best thing I could find at that time available. They show some weaknesses. They are not too strong.

Mr. Kendall. General, in your prepared statement yesterday you characterized Secretary McNamara's testimony before the full Committee last September as -- and here I quote -- "slander and defamation of my character and reputation in the privileged sanctuary of a Senate Committee".

Were you referring in this remark to the fact that, when testifying before a Senate Committee, he was immune from any

action for slander or libel?

Mr. Walker. Not necessarily so.

Mr. Kendall. What did you mean by that remark, sir?

Mr. Walker. That could be included with respect to the use of releasing an investigation in the military service unprecedented, which immediately was misused, and, in itself, by its release, became misrepresentation.

Mr. Kendall. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Stennis. All right, thank you.

Mr. Walker. May I clarify?

Senator Stennis. Yes.

Mr. Walker. I should like to clarify my own testimony and certain facts about The Taro Leaf editorial, ACA Index --

Senator Stennis. General, before you move into that, the Chair would like to inquire what time does the Senate convene today?

Senator Cannon. Eleven o'clock.

Senator Stennis. There is a rather important debate going on over there.

While the Senators are here, I am going to give them a chance to ask questions, if they have any, and we will clear up your matter later.

Gentlemen, I think we can have any other questions now by any members of the Committee and any members of the full Committee.

Senator Thurmond, did you have anything further?

Senator Thurmond. Mr. Chairman, I do not have any further questions right now.

Senator Stennis. Senator Bartlett?

Senator Bartlett. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General, it is my recollection that yesterday you described the Overseas Weekly as being subversive. Is my memory right?

Mr. Walker. That is correct, sir.

Senator Bartlett. Did you have any investigation relating to this made by Army Intelligence?

Mr. Walker. I did not have an official investigation made by Army Intelligence.

I had a 16th Air Force study and recommendation, which I have referred to in the previous portions of the investigation of this hearing -- not investigation -- and I mentioned that "subversive" does not necessarily mean Communist.

It can be, as the Regulations indicate that I have referred to for banning it, it can be subversive to the interests of the military service and/or the responsibilities of a commander.

Senator Bartlett. The 16th Air Force is located where, in Spain?

Mr. Walker. At that time it was a Major General, now promoted to Lieutenant General, who was in command in Spain, sir, of a major unit in Spain.

Senator Bartlett. Do you know if the Army, other than the 24th Division, made an investigation into the Overseas Weekly as



to its possibly being subversive?

Mr. Walker. I would say yes, that the Army has made investigations for a period prior to, continuously and prior to General Volpe's banning it on the newsstand, certainly for a ten-year period.

When I got to Europe, I was informed by professional BIO's that certain members of the Overseas Weekly staff bragged about their capability to relieve an officer, and the figure that was around was that there were 11 senior officers had been either reassigned or their positions made untenable by this paper's activities.

I found recently an officer that is now stationed in the Pentagon that told me he took it off of the Headquarters newsstand in Heidelberg himself.

I know that General Gavin in Munich, when I was there, Major General Gavin, commanding the Southern Area Command in support of that area, ordered Mr. Naujocks, the reporter, off of his concern and only allowed him back on with an escort. The Overseas Weekly had published statements that were false.

Senator Bartlett. Do you know if the Army ever officially described the Overseas Weekly as being subversive by any definition of that word?

Mr. Walker. Sir, I am very sorry, but I missed the question.

Senator Bartlett. Do you know if the Army ever officially

determined the Overseas Weekly to be subversive by any definition which might be applied to that word?

Mr. Walker. Yes, sir.

It is my information from a senior officer that there was a staff study in the Pentagon which he saw that classified the Overseas Weekly as subversive.

The staff study was brought to light when this officer, before a Congressional Committee, was asked by a Congressman something about an article the Overseas Weekly published regarding the fire in Germany of the Hotel Frankfurt Arms, Frankfurt Arms Hotel, a transient military hotel, at Fifth Corps Headquarters, and the Congressmen were curious about the Overseas Weekly report that this covered up a lot of money lost, this fire.

So he rushed back to the Pentagon to find the answer to this question in his hearing to be able to produce it before Congress, and he got the study, and he saw the study classifying the Overseas Weekly as subversive.

That is the information by a senior officer.

Senator Bartlett. Do you remember when the fire occurred, General?

Mr. Walker. Sir, not accurately. I would say probably in the area of 1955, 1956 or 1957.

Senator Bartlett. And do you know when the Congressional hearing took place?

Mr. Walker. It was not on this subject, sir. It was a

hearing, he was before a hearing, a financial hearing here.

Senator Bartlett. Do you know when that was?

Mr. Walker. No, sir.

Senator Bartlett. Now, General, I wonder if you would expand a bit more on the allusion you made to the Columbia Broadcasting System being involved in your own personal situation.

You mentioned that on page 29 and page 30, I believe, of your prepared statement, but did not amplify it. How did CBS enter into this?

Mr. Walker. I referred to Mr. Schorr's remarks. I have a copy here of the Dallas News-Times Herald, and a panel of the CBS people before the World Affairs Council in Dallas, Texas. During this panel discussion there was a question from the floor regarding General Walker.

Mr. Schorr said to Mr. Severeid:

"Let me have the question. After all, I sent him back here."

Here is the tape.

Senator Stennis. General, what was that last quote you gave, "after all" what?

Mr. Walker. "After all, I sent him back here."

Senator Stennis. "Sent him back"?

Mr. Walker. "Sent him back here."

Senator Bartlett. I still do not understand yet how this

relates to your situation, General.

I wonder if you would amplify that a bit.

Mr. Walker. How this what, sir?

Senator Bartlett. Relates to your own situation.

Mr. Walker. I do not understand it either in detail, but I can assure you that I consider that it is all involved in the overall intent to stop a hard anti-Communist line in a Division in Europe.

Senator Bartlett. With the Chairman's permission, I wonder if I might ask the General if he would be willing to make the tape available for the use of the Committee.

Senator Stennis. Yes, you may ask.

Senator Bartlett. Could you do that, General?

Mr. Walker. Yes, I will, sir.

Senator Bartlett. Thank you.

General Walker, in your opinion, what should be the proper role of the military officer with respect to the public in such areas as speeches and seminars?

Mr. Walker. I might add to that other question that I am sure Mr. Schorr could explain more to this Committee on this point than I can.

The relationship between the public and the military on speeches, I feel the National Administration, as well as we here, should take full cognizance of the necessities that are involved in this area.

You will find the public, to a certain extent, in bewilderment at our peril and our national policy.

You will find the military hunting a cause and a purpose, which naturally originates from the people through this Congress. So there is a natural, instinctive drawing of the two together in search of the answer.

There is a great vacuum, and the only solution brings these two areas together; the military as the agency of implementing a national policy that basically should, and under the Constitution, originates with the people.

So this is inevitable and, of course, it is a very threatening condition to an Administration that does not want it to happen.

They must divide it and divide it fast, and they are so doing. The greatest power in the world is the power of a great nation, unified in its cause and purposes as a team.

The day that this happens, the people understand the conditions of the peril and the international conspiracy's threat upon it, a public cause and purpose of 180 million people is so great in extent and its capability that no country on earth could threaten it.

This is the only circumvention to war, and the reason we become closer to war and dire peril is because we have been infiltrated, disunified, and our causes and purposes intentionally headed in many and various directions.

People would indicate that I or a military man naturally wants to go to war.

This is untrue.

I want to unify the greatest force in the world for the future of this country, and that force, even greater than bearing arms, is the force of a unified cause and purpose in a free Christian country, and it is the only circumvention to war.

The role of the military officer in speaking before military groups, civilian groups or military, is the same, as it has to be -- they cannot be different from that -- that he is speaking to his sons and his soldiers.

It must be absolutely the same.

Today it should be a hard, anti-Communist line approach.

Senator Bartlett. Should that be an extensive program on the part of the military establishment so far as the public is concerned?

Mr. Walker. Basically, and most important, it should have been done by somebody else.

It should not fall in the responsibility of the military to do it, but certainly the military should not be denied from doing it under the national peril and the necessity for support they need from the public.

All true power and all true support comes from the people of the United States.

It is a responsibility in this situation for the military

to inform the public of the enemy, his debauchery, his means and his method.

Senator Bartlett. General, may I quote from one sentence of your prepared statement yesterday on page 3. I will quote the entire sentence.

You said:

"It is evident that the real control apparatus will not tolerate militant anti-Communist leadership by a Division Commander."

Will you tell us just what you mean by the words "real control apparatus"?

Mr. Walker. The "real control apparatus" can be identified by its effects and what it is doing, what it did in Cuba, what it is doing in the Congo, what it did in Korea. All these things were done by people.

This country is too great for these things just to happen, and its influences and its economy.

So the apparatus is in those who wanted to see these things happen, and the propaganda front that they are using for this and the means to do it with is the United Nations which is the nearest thing to the Tower of Babel that has ever been built.

Senator Bartlett. But my inference from this statement would be that there exists in this country in positions of ultimate leadership a group of sinister men, anti-American, willing and wanting even to sell this country out.

Is that the correct inference I should gain from this sentence?

Mr. Walker. That is correct, yes, sir.

Senator Bartlett. I beg your pardon?

Mr. Walker. That is correct, yes, sir.

When you refer to "sell-out" as a sell-out of our traditions, our Constitution, our sovereignty, our independence, that is correct.

Senator Bartlett. General, I think that the nation is entitled to know the names of these men, because, according to this statement, they are traitors and ready to let this country go over to our enemies.

Would you name those people?

Mr. Walker. I will name people that are opposite from my line of thinking with regard to the Constitution, the security and the independence of this country.

Senator Bartlett. Will you name them and tell me at the same time if you consider them to be members of the "real control apparatus"?

Mr. Walker. I cannot identify those that are completely in control of the apparatus. I have identified individuals who appear to think on the same lines as the apparatus, which has been a "no win" policy.

Senator Bartlett. Would you name those people you had in mind, then, please, that you were going to name before I inter-



rupted you?

Mr. Walker. I question the following people with respect to our constitutional system, our sovereignty, our security, our independence:

Mr. Dean Rusk - it is my understanding he was on Stilwell's staff during the agrarian reform highlights of that day. He was a member and a supporter of the Institute of Pacific Relations, which was greatly influenced by Owen Lattimore.

I believe his story is a matter of record before the Internal Security Committee of the Senate.

Senator Bartlett. And the other names?

Mr. Walker. All the other names are available, I believe, through what is available in the Internal Security Committee and their records.

Senator Bartlett. I would like you to name them so we can have your personal conclusion as to who the members of this "real control apparatus" or subsidiaries might be.

Mr. Walker. I can only indicate those that I believe to have influence in this apparatus.

Senator Bartlett. You have named Secretary Rusk. Do you have anyone else in mind?

Mr. Walker. Mr. Walter Rostow, Walt -- I believe it is Rostow -- who has been in control of the operating arm of CIA, I believe since 1954.

Senator Bartlett. Anyone else?

Mr. Walker. I believe their responsibilities will cover all the others.

Senator Bartlett. Your personal opinion is --

Mr. Walker. Not all but enough of the others. Pardon me.

Senator Bartlett. You consider these two men to be leaders?

Mr. Walker. I am sorry, sir, I consider them to be very influential.

Senator Bartlett. In this conspiracy which, if successful, would mean the end of the United States?

Mr. Walker. In the apparatus which I consider the hidden policy of the State Department, which is a soft-line policy, Senator.

Senator Bartlett. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Stennis. Thank you, Senator Bartlett.

We have Senator Beall of Maryland with us this morning. I am glad he could come in. He is a member of the regular Armed Services Committee.

Senator Beall?

Senator Beall. I have no questions.

Senator Stennis. Senator Cannon is with us this morning, too, from the full Armed Services Committee.

Senator, we will be glad to hear from you now, sir.

Senator Cannon. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Walker, on page 12 of your prepared statement you said

yesterday:

"As far as my military career was concerned, my assignment to Germany amounted to entrapment."

Is it your view that you were deliberately assigned to Germany for the purpose of discrediting you? Do I draw the correct inference?

Mr. Walker. Certainly not, sir.

Senator Cannon. What did you mean when you said that as far as your career was concerned, that your assignment there then amounted to entrapment?

Mr. Walker. A Moscow dossier was being made on me, no doubt, from the time of my Little Rock assignment and even from my career assignment, I am sure.

Senator Cannon. Is that all? Is that why you feel that this was an assignment that amounted to entrapment because someone was making a dossier on you?

Mr. Walker. As events occurred and as you can trace them through the Communist publications overseas and over here, it finally led up to me being pointed out while I was still in Germany as an ultra. An ultra is a Communist target. It comes from the revolutionary days. It is a noun. It means "get him".

Senator Cannon. Is it your view, then, that someone deliberately wanted you assigned over there so that they could trap you in this ultra position? Is that it?

I am just trying to find out what you mean by the word

"entrapment".

As I understand it, it means a deliberate attempt to trap someone in a position.

Mr. Walker. It could have been a deliberate attempt to keep me from resigning at that time, and to censor me further in placing me in a command of a United States Army Division.

Senator Cannon. Then do you feel that that is what it was? Is that why you make your statement that your assignment to Germany amounted to entrapment?

Mr. Walker. From what I read in the Communist Party line, I do.

Senator Cannon. From what you felt when you wrote this statement in your prepared text, is that what you felt?

Mr. Walker. That is correct.

Senator Cannon. Now, you stated in your prepared text that you had never been legally accused of violating the Hatch Act. Now, one of the specifications in the investigation was that you had been guilty of violating the Hatch Act, and one of the findings of the Acting Judge Advocate General of the Army was that you were guilty.

Now, is it your position, then, when you say that you were never legally accused of violating the Hatch Act, that that investigation was illegal?

Mr. Walker. No, sir.

But I am saying just exactly what the Senator -- Cannon? --

Mr. Kendall. Yes, sir.

Mr. Walker. (Continuing) -- may be falling into line with, and that is that an investigation can be a charge, an accusation. A finding, it cannot, under A. R. 20-1. And that is what has been intended by the Administration, to indicate that it was. There has been no findings of anything.

The only finding you can say -- and it is no finding -- a military commander has a right to admonish anybody he wants for anything, as he sees it.

Senator Cannon. Is it your contention that the investigation, that as a result of the investigation, there was not a finding -- and I am quoting now -- that stated this:

"In instituting and carrying out this program, General Walker violated the Hatch Act and those Army Regulations" -- referring to Army Regulations A. R. 600-10, 608-20, 355-5 -- "in implementation thereof, which prohibit military personnel from using their official authority or influence to affect the course of an election or to influence a member of the Armed Forces in his vote for a candidate for election."

Now, is it your contention that there was no such finding as a result of that investigation?

Mr. Walker. There is no such finding as you are inferring here right now, sir.

This is an internal investigation, a preliminary investigation to an investigation that has to be done under Article 32,

I believe it is, before you can even be charged. You have got to substantiate charges in the Army by another investigation under the Court-Martial Manual, Article 32.

This is a preliminary investigation for a commander to make decisions on, whether he wants to go ahead with another investigation.

Senator Cannon. But it is not your contention that this investigation was illegal?

Mr. Walker. It is illegal the way it has been used.

Senator Cannon. Did you ever appeal from the finding of this investigation?

Mr. Walker. Sir?

Senator Cannon. Did you ever appeal from the findings of this investigation?

Mr. Walker. There is no appeal from an admonition. That is all the investigation wound up with.

Senator Cannon. That is the admonition that you received as a result of this investigation?

Mr. Walker. Yes, sir.

General Clarke, I have all due respect for his opinions, he made an admonition of this.

Senator Cannon. And did you protest that the admonition was not warranted?

Mr. Walker. I did not feel that I had any protest coming. That was his decision.

I disagree in using Brown's decision and what Brown thinks, which I disagree with and do not agree with, in many, many areas, with regard to Troop Information, politics and other things. We do not see eye to eye at all.

Senator Cannon. But you did not protest the admonition from General Clarke?

Mr. Walker. No, sir.

I cannot.

Senator Cannon. Mr. Walker, on page 5 you made the statement --

Mr. Walker. Are you inferring, sir, that I could protest an admonition in the military service?

Senator Cannon. Well, I --

Mr. Walker. An oral admonition?

Senator Cannon. I would certainly think that one could protest, if he felt that he had been admonished for something that was not a fact, that he could protest to his commander, Mr. Walker.

Yes, my answer is yes to that.

Mr. Walker. Well, I am sure that the General knew I did not like it a bit.

Senator Cannon. Referring to page 5 of your statement, you say:

"The U. S. Army Contemporary Military Reading Program List for 1960" included certain books that were under discussion yes-

terday by certain writers.

Now, did this Military Reading Program List contain books that you did approve of?

Mr. Walker. No, I had no action on this list. This is an over-all library list that they use at Headquarters, Command.

Senator Cannon. I understand.

You say you did not approve of these books on the list for certain reasons, in your views.

Now I am asking you if the list contained books that you, in your own views, did approve of.

In other words, was this entire list made up of books that you disapproved of, or were there books on the list of which you did approve?

Mr. Walker. There are books on the list, in my opinion -- I have not reviewed them all; I am not familiar; some are good; some are fair; and some are not good.

Senator Cannon. And you objected to these particular ones, in your own views, because you felt that they presented a philosophy that you did not agree with and that our military should not be subjected to, is that correct?

Mr. Walker. The ones I have referred to.

Senator Cannon. Yes.

Have you read all of the books by the other writers, other than the ones by Overstreet that you said you have not read?



Have you read the books by Walter Millis that you listed?

Mr. Walker. No, I have not.

Senator Cannon. Have you read the books by John Gunther that you listed?

Mr. Walker. No, I have not.

Senator Cannon. Have you read the books by Max Lerner that you listed?

Mr. Walker. No, sir.

Senator Cannon. You mean you just took a position against all of these books without having read any of them?

Mr. Walker. I have had discussions about certain ones of them and read reviews of certain ones of them and have had discussions with regard to them.

Senator Cannon. But you never read any of the books written by any of these authors whom you criticize?

Mr. Walker. I have listened to discussions of these authors and their line and point of view.

Senator Cannon. That was not my question, Mr. Walker.

My question was:

Have you read any of the books by these authors?

Mr. Walker. I believe I have answered that; that I did not read these books.

Senator Cannon. Now, is it your view, then, that in the Contemporary Military Reading Program List published for the use of our military services, that we should present only one particu-

lar viewpoint?

Mr. Walker. I did not say that, sir.

I said we should not have the Nation, the New Republic, the Worker --

Senator Cannon. I do not think you said that.

Mr. Walker. (Continuing) -- on an official distribution list for our libraries.

Senator Cannon. I do not think you said that, Mr. Walker, nor does your statement say that.

I am asking you if it is your belief that we should present only one particular viewpoint on an approved reading list for our Services?

Mr. Walker. No.

We should present all viewpoints, but nothing that is subversive.

Senator Cannon. And it is your position that the writings of these particular men are subversive, is that correct?

Mr. Walker. They are not pro-American enough to assist a commander in his causes by a long, long way.

Senator Cannon. Thank you, Mr. Walker.

Now, relating to your testimony concerning the film "Operation Abolition," I think it has been admitted that the initial issue of this film contained errors in fact, and inaccuracies. Is it your belief that non-factual films and films containing inaccuracies should be used in our indoctrination and/or our troop

training programs?

Mr. Walker. Will you please let me know where the inaccuracies are and on what basis this film is inaccurate?

Senator Cannon. I think that it has been pretty well established and admitted by the Committee and by the FBI that there were inaccuracies and non-factual errors.

Mr. Walker. There were only, as I understand it, Senator Cannon, there were only administrative possible inaccuracies with respect to which picture came first or last or whether this man was going in or going out.

What difference does that make? That is the typical Communist line, to discredit the whole film. The film is an official film by the House Un-American Activities Committee, as far as I know.

Senator Cannon. I do not think you have answered my question.

My question was:

Do you believe that non-factual films or films containing inaccurate representations should be used in our troop indoctrination programs?

Mr. Walker. Your description of the film is unfair, Senator Cannon.

Senator Cannon. Let us just forget about a description of the film and just answer the question.

Mr. Walker. If you would like me to answer the question, I

will, but not with regard to "Operation Abolition," because I see we disagree on the film.

Senator Cannon. All right, then, if you will, just answer the question.

Do you believe that non-factual films and films containing inaccuracies should be used in our troop training and indoctrination program?

Mr. Walker. There is no yes and no to that answer, if there is something that is story-wise or fictional that follows the course of American traditions and constitutional government. You cannot lay down a flat no-facts films or books in the library. I would like to see the size of the staff that would have to establish fact.

For instance, I refer to the fact that came up in my investigation, and it was the one where the technical advisor to the investigation said that a certain book was not factual because it stated that there was a study for surrender, an official study for surrender.

Now, as far as I know, there was an official study for surrender.

So I am not sure everybody knows what is factual and what is not.

But this refers back to an investigation and investigation only, so what difference does it make?

Senator Cannon. But you cannot answer the question either

yes or no, then, from --

Mr. Walker. Well, nobody can, in my opinion. There are a lot of movies and everything that are shown to the troops that are inspirational; psychological warfare cannot be factual when you put out pamphlets that say -- imposing on the physical and mental testing ability on a soldier with respect to what is happening at home.

That is one of the grave mistakes you have brought up that is causing a great problem in this area, because of one of the regulations in Troop Information says that everything must be factual.

So if it has got to be factual, there is going to be a lot of material that cannot be used that is necessary.

Senator Cannon. Then I take it from that, that your view is that non-factual information should be used in the program?

Mr. Walker. We are talking in two different areas, I think.

Senator Cannon. I see.

Now, Mr. Walker, you said yesterday that the Communists had infiltrated the U. S. Government and that they had also infiltrated the Army.

I wonder if you could list some of the specific instances for me at this time.

Mr. Walker. Yes.

I believe we have only caught one truly, Mr. Alger Hiss, and I believe you can refer to Mr. Lackland Curry, and I believe

you can refer to the Castro -- I do not know what status we consider -- the government and the Army?

Senator Cannon. Yes.

Your statement was the government and the Army and I would like to know the specifics of both, so far as known to you.

Mr. Walker. You can refer to Perez, I believe; you can refer to Mr. Alger Hiss.

Senator Cannon. Who is that?

Mr. Walker. Perez.

Senator Cannon. Are you using him as one in the Army or one in the government?

Mr. Walker. He was the Army, sir.

Senator Cannon. And do you have any more recent ones than that?

Mr. Walker. We gave the name of a man that has admitted before an Internal Security Committee that he was placed in the Army.

Senator Cannon. When you say "we," who do you refer to?

Mr. Walker. I refer to my previous statement, sir, in this investigation.

Senator Cannon. I see.

Mr. Walker. I should have said "I". A man by the name of Mr. Paul Crouch.

Senator Cannon. Mr. Paul Crouch?

Mr. Walker. Who testified he was put in the Army to estab-

lish cells as far back as 1928.

We must recognize that the Communists have infiltrated every government. It would be naive to believe we are immune.

Senator Cannon. Yes, I understand that, but I am trying to find out if you know specifics, because I think that would be helpful to the government and would be helpful to the Army. You have listed one man you say infiltrated in 1928 and you have listed Mr. Perez.

Now, I am wondering if you have others that you are aware of, referring particularly to the Army now, so we can take them one at a time.

Mr. Walker. I know that they have people in the military service and have had, and continuously have, people under surveillance and close watch, and I believe the information you desire can be found from the FBI or the Internal Security Committee.

Senator Cannon. Have you ever turned any information over to the FBI concerning your suspicions on any of these people?

Mr. Walker. I have turned my suspicions with respect to certain -- I have had contacts with the FBI with respect to certain individuals I considered bore watching.

Senator Cannon. You have turned in names of individuals that you felt were --

Mr. Walker. In those cases they were not military.

Senator Cannon. You never turned any military names into the FBI for investigation?

Mr. Walker. None that I can recall, that I had enough information on to justify it.

Senator Cannon. And do you have any specific persons in mind now other than the gentleman you referred to in 1928 and Mr. Perez?

Mr. Walker. Just Communist infiltration in the Military Establishment.

Senator Cannon. Just generally. You have no specific persons in mind, to your knowledge?

Mr. Walker. No, I have not, sir.

Senator Cannon. Now, would you name for us some of the Communists that you say have infiltrated into the U. S. Government that you have in mind, if you have any in mind?

Mr. Walker. I would like to refer to the statement where I said Communists.

Senator Cannon. Where you said that? That was in your oral testimony yesterday, Mr. Walker.

You said that Communists had infiltrated, when you began with the statement concerning the Army, since 1928, and you said that also they have infiltrated in the United States Government, and I would like to know now some specifics, if you can point them out.

Mr. Walker. I am not ready to release any right now, sir.

Senator Cannon. Do you have information?

Mr. Walker. I would rather bear on the importance of those



that are not standing up for America, our constitutional government and sovereignty.

Senator Cannon. But you have no names that you can release for us now that would specifically fall within that category?

Mr. Walker. None that I have not already established, sir.

Senator Cannon. Thank you very much.

Mr. Walker. Under the conditions under which I established them at the time.

Senator Stennis. All right, gentlemen of the Committee. The Chair understand that that completes the questioning. If so, why, we will proceed now.

The General has a statement he wants to make about the ACA list.

And you indicated last night that you had other matters you might wish to bring up.

Mr. Walker. Right, sir.

Senator Stennis. You may proceed, General.

Mr. Walker. I should like to clarify my own testimony and certain facts about The Taro Leaf editorial, the ACA Index, and the charge that I used improper political influence.

Of course, there has been no charge, but Mr. Kendall read to me part of the printed versions of General Clarke's oral admonition quoted by Secretary McNamara on September the 6th, as follows:

"This policy of not participating in political activities

you" -- that is I, Walker -- "have violated despite the fact that the Commanding General, 7th Corps, in August and October, 1960, and the Commanding General, 7th Army, in March, 1961, advised you against extending your activities into political and related controversial areas."

I am not sure of the details of my answer yesterday, but I may have left a wrong impression.

I believe at one point I left the impression that I did receive letters with such advice.

I know that at another point I did, and I denied the accuracy of General Clarke's opinion and statement as I saw it. His statement was inaccurate, more inaccurate than I had remembered or brought out yesterday.

I reviewed the text of letters in question which are dated as General Clarke indicated, but that the contents of which are not correctly indicated by General Clarke.

None of the three letters contains one word about political activities.

The one and subject matter of all three are fairly indicated in a statement that the letters are, basically, regarding the Pro Blue Program and that portion of the program applicable to anti-Communist indoctrination.

I gave these letters full consideration in their application to the program.

I find it hard to understand at what point it becomes

inappropriate for a professional military officer to emphasize patriotism or follow a hard anti-Communist line.

I repeat:

None of the three "Dear Ted" letters of advice even mentioned politics. One of them was written two months before the editorial in The Taro Leaf, of which General Brown and Secretary McNamara seem to have made so much.

The other two were written afterward.

None of the letters mentions The Taro Leaf and none mentions the ACA Index.

Since the letters, no doubt, were thoughtfully composed, it is fair to conclude that if either commander had reason to object to The Taro Leaf editorial or the ACA index, this would have been the time to do it.

The letter of advice from the Corps Commander was written on October the 18th, just eight days after he had written me on October the 10th, acknowledging the copy of the ACA Index I had sent him.

He wrote:

"Thanks heaps for sending it."

General Norstad could now write someone today and say:

"Thanks heaps for giving me the responsibility to retain the OW on the newsstands."

One can only conclude that General Brown was the first to think of, or think up, the idea that I had used improper political

influence.

General Clarke could use this opinion, or General Brown's, as his own in any admonition, but it certainly has no conclusive proof or any such proof as intended or indicated by the Secretary McNamara.

It was only a preliminary investigation.

Sir, I would like to make another statement with regard to another subject which may help clarify.

Senator Stennis. All right, General, you may proceed.

Mr. Walker. Our conformance to a "no win" policy has resulted in an obvious demoralizing and downgrading effect on all military intelligence.

A key activity in intelligence work is the preparation of estimates; that is, estimates of the enemy's capability and intentions.

In a cold-war world, national policy must be decided on the basis of such estimates.

Thus, the CIA is in a position to determine national policy in the sense that it furnishes the supposed facts upon which other agencies of government base their conclusions.

Miscalculation or inequity in the CIA causes distortion of policy, even if every other agency were highly competent and patriotic. However, there is reason to fear the CIA and the State Department, as well as key officials in other parts of the government who understand each other very well.

There is reason to fear, too, that they have one vital relationship reversed: That is, instead of the State Department planning policy on the basis of estimates from the CIA, the CIA furnishes estimates figured out to fit policy already planned and desired by the State Department in conformance with their collaborating, "no win" policy.

For example, it makes no sense for our government to be talking about sharing space secrets and nuclear secrets with the Soviets.

The world knows for sure that Colonel Glenn orbited the earth in a satellite from Cape Canaveral, but the story of Gagarin and Titov's alleged flights are so full of glaring inconsistencies never explained that there is no reason to think why we have anything to gain from entering a partnership with Russia in this field.

It is like a millionaire going partners with a hobo in a business venture and like going partners with a known crook. Even if the Soviet Union has some information we do not have, we would still not get it if we went partners with them, if they did not desire us to have it.

All new information so far about space has come from U. S. earth satellites, in spite of the alleged priority of the Sputniks and alleged greater thrust of their rockets.

And Mr. Eisenhower's congratulations to them on their picture of the backside of the moon was very likely a picture

out of our own Popular Mechanics.

The spirit of sending such a cable is further reflected in raising a flag beside the American flag in Panama.

The taking of such chances as proposing to share space secrets can be explained only as the basis of intelligence estimates which give Russia a very high rating in Sputnik capability and willingness to cooperate.

I question estimates being continuously based upon our own magnification of Russian capability.

The whole matter is of fundamental importance and of far greater breadth and variety than I have indicated or can indicate briefly.

I will say that unless we make sure that our intelligence estimates are free of distortions and misrepresentations, unless we take every precaution to get and take into the intelligence account all available facts so that we will be in a position to take advantage of enemy weakness, instead of remaining in awe of exaggerated enemy power, then we will be unable to change our present "no win" policy.

I have said before that not all those who are causing us to lose are Communists.

The supercilious attitude of the State Department toward the military is unjustified by facts and causes the State Department to ignore many facts, just because they come from a military source.

military and State Department representatives on country teams where the State Department man is always in charge, but where the military man is actually better informed.

The senior military representative in a foreign country is always on the team, but the State Department representative leads the teams and makes the report to Washington.

I was told by an officer that he informed the Ambassador in Turkey that there would be a coup in Turkey within six weeks. The Ambassador implied that he was imagining things that were not so.

The coup occurred in four weeks.

It is the Menderis coup who now, I believe, has been hung.

Many military men, as well as super patriots, correctly anticipated the Communist take-over of Cuba, but the State Department or the New York Times, either did not anticipate it or else wanted it to happen.

Everything of this sort goes back to estimates, and these are made in CIA.

I suggest that the whole area should be reappraised by the Congress.

I want it perfectly clear that my complete testimony should conclude for all, as it certainly does for me, that I was framed in a den of iniquity represented by a coexistence, "no win," collaborating, soft-on-Communism national policy.

This is the hidden State Department policy being implemented now by Mr. Rusk and being withheld from public view.

It was the policy that I ran into head-on.

The commissariat system is set up to insure conformance by our military to the soft, "no win" policy.

I have been accused of calling people Communists. This is untrue, because I reserve the right to call them something worse, such as traitors to the American system of constitutional government, national and state sovereignty and independence.

This great and powerful nation has not reached a state of dire peril from which it may not survive without those people in our government, past and present, who directed it to this peril.

This has been greatly assisted by a mass, ultra-liberal, left-wing press and media propaganda curtain over this country, and extending to most nations.

As I have stated before, today no nation can be anti-Communist and pro-American. We will not allow it. They must forego their independence, join the United Nations, and collaborate fully with them.

I have previously referred to the public since my return to Texas --I have previously referred in public since my return to Texas to Hammarskjold as Red. There is adequate evidence in the murder of Bang Jensen because of what he knew, what he had in knowledge and possession at the time of his death, to justify



the Red classification for Mr. Hammarskjold.

The Hammarskjold UN war in the Congo supported by us against the anti-Communist Tshombe is vicious and outrageous. I am further told from high source that this outrage is worse than anyone has yet conceived.

Of course, the greatest uranium mines in the world are at stake. There is every reason to believe that the Russians have complete records on the workings of private American accounts in Swiss banks.

We gave Russians the Czechoslovakian and German uranium mines in 1945, but the ones in Africa are much more important. So we, no doubt, will give them these now.

General MacArthur, Senator Joseph McCarthy, Secretary James Forrestal, Syngman Rhee, Chiang Kai-shek, Tshombe, myself and others, with more to come, as well as untold thousands who have not made the headlines, have all been framed by this hidden policy.

I ask how is the cold war going to be won against a treacherous enemy that continues to be the greatest beneficiary since 1933 of the present policy?

If a complete reversal of our "no win" policy, national policy, is not achieved through the exposure of this policy to public view, we are digging our own grave for Khrushchev to bury us in.

It is three feet deep now. Buying UN bonds adds six more

inches. The repeal of the Connally Amendment will add another foot.

The State Department's program for our disarmament could be two more feet, and all that is necessary.

And I would like to refer at this time to the State Department's publication of September, 1961, "Freedom from War". It is actually the United States program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world.

I believe every soldier has a right to see this.

My Pro Blue Program, as I told General Clarke, would have included Mr. Fulbright's complete statement passed to every officer in the command before nightfall, with no notes or endorsement of any kind.

That I consider Pro Blue. I do not believe it is necessary to remind what that memorandum stated.

At this time I would like to mention that this publication, a program for our disarmament while we have arms and soldiers practically all over the world, is a plan for placing all Armed Forces under an international organization, the United Nations, placing all weapons under an international organization, building only those weapons necessary for the internal police of the United States.

I believe it would be hard for a 22-year-old Lieutenant to explain to 100 seventeen-to-twenty-year-old soldiers why they are in Germany, under this program.

I believe this indicates that maybe we had better do something about a program.

I would like to add, we are now in a state of transition. It is a change from the Constitution which provides for defending ourselves now to let an international organization do it for us. It is a change from constitutional sovereignty, our traditional heritage and government by, for and of the people.

I swore allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, to defend her against all enemies foreign and domestic. The State Department has commenced its program to take our weapons, the greatest in the world, and physically give them to our enemies.

Some index may soon refer to what the voting record was on this piece of legislation. I hope it does. I swore allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, to defend her against all enemies foreign and domestic.

The State Department has commenced its program to take our weapons, the greatest in the world, and physically give them to our enemies, leaving us none for the defense of our country. For many years we have given them the secrets, blueprints, technical knowledge of our greatest weapons.

It is clear that my training program stressing the identity and methods of the Communist conspiracy and as an enemy was not in consonance with, or in support of, this program, the hidden, secret program of our government's national policy.

I ask the question:

Who is to de-Americanize the soldier from his loyalties, homes, the oath he serves under, the officer's oath?

Who is to de-Americanize the soldier?

And then who is to UN-ize him?

Who is to change his spiritual and moral loyalty from duty, honor, country?

Certainly, it cannot be done by an Army officer under the oath of allegiance to the Constitution.

For it to be done, the American people must first be brain-washed on UNism, so they will accept such a program.

Where is the Training Program and the Troop Information Program?

Where is the Training Program and the Troop Information Program to implement the training of soldiers to man the United Nations weapons which we built, which could be fired at the United States on UN decision?

Why has Mr. McNamara, the Secretary of Defense, not issued this program to the Army so the public and every soldier would know the State Department's plan?

Is it a secret or is it censorship of the soldier and the public?

Churchill well stated that our failure to throttle Bolshevism at birth and force Soviet Russia, then prostrate, to become a member of the democratic community of nations will remain to haunt

us.

Our failure to do the same with the United Nations before reaching the point of no return will do the same.

After 30 years of service, I am seeking no honor, no glory, or remuneration. I have been charged with nothing. I have been found guilty of nothing, and I have been punished for nothing. I am proud of my 30 years with the greatest soldiers on this earth.

I revere the ground they walk on and their cause will be ever sacred as they serve our Christian homes, the repository of all faith, hope, freedom and power.

I have no regrets and I seek no further remuneration.

Beyond that, I have had in the competence in my men the greatest sacrifices on the field of battle. I shall never betray their competence and trust.

I continue in their cause and purpose to defend them in their rights to protect their lands and home against the most debauched, treacherous and anti-Christian enemy ever known.

I am signed up for the duration under the same oath and the same code, duty, honor, country, that I served for thirty years.

I have found a new freedom, uncensored and unmuzzled, among a host of dedicated, patriotic and militant Christians, willing to fight for the cause of freedom, sovereignty, constitutional government and independence.

In peril and at war, courage and faith will prevail as the destructive force of little and evil men tremble in their seditious conspiracy against mankind.

I dedicate my life in the cold war to those I served for 30 years in full knowledge now of their betrayal and in full memory of those who will not return.

Thank you, sir.

Senator Stennis. All right, General, do you have anything further?

Mr. Walker. Only to fulfill any requirements that there are, sir, further requirements.

Senator Stennis. Thank you.

Are there any other questions, gentlemen of the Committee?

Cantor  
fls notes  
aw

Senator Thurmond. Mr. Chairman, I finished my questions to General Walker last night. There has been a question raised here this morning concerning the authenticity of the film Operation Abolition. In view of that, I would like to have reference made in the record to a document prepared by the House Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives dated 1961, Union Calendar No. 546.

On page 1 of this document it is stated:

"Operation Abolition" is a 45-minute documentary film portraying certain of the events which took place on May 12, 13 and 14, 1960, in the course of hearings held in San Francisco by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The film is also an integral part of an official report of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the House of Representatives. As such, it has the official endorsement of the committee, just as all other committee reports do.

"The title of the film is derived from the name which the Communist Party itself has given to its current, greatly intensified drive to have the committee abolished."

The Senate out in California had a fact-finding Subcommittee which reported on this film, and I shall just quote one paragraph of its report:

"Motion pictures \* \* \* were taken of the demonstrations, and are now being shown throughout the state. These pictures speak for themselves and show the proceedings in all their

ugly and stark realism; those few individuals who are concerned with counter-subversive activities can readily identify the leading Communist Party figures as they moved about performing their assigned tasks with a military precision, according to plan. In an effort to offset the profound effect this motion picture is having wherever it is viewed, the Communist Party is now starting a campaign of seeking to undermine the picture by charging that it was heavily edited in favor of the Committee."

Then on page 51, a short two-page summary is given of the riot out in California. It says:

"This report reveals not only that all responsible authorities completely support the Committee on Un-American Activities in its claim that the San Francisco riots were Communist-instigated, but also cites facts revealing that the following organizations, all either influenced or controlled outright by the Communist Party, were involved in the San Francisco demonstrations and riots:

"All Communist Party units in the San Francisco area;

"Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms,  
San Francisco chapter;

"East Bay Community Forum;

"Bay Area Defense Committee;

"National Lawyers Guild, San Francisco chapter;

"International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union;



"SIATE;

"Student Committee for Civil Liberties:

"'The Daily Californian.'

"This report also reveals that Mickey Lima, Roscoe Proctor, and Juanita Wheeler, currently the three representatives of the Northern California District of the Communist Party on the party's National Committee, played important roles in the demonstrations and riots. It reveals that Archie Brown, second in command of the Communist Party in Northern California, a former member of the party's National Committee and political commissar of Company I, Battalion 58, of the International Brigade in the Spanish Civil War, also played a vital part in both the pre-hearing activity and the agitation that took place while the committee was in session. The same is true of Frank Wilkinson, formerly the head of the security unit of the Communist Party in Los Angeles and, until he went to jail recently, the national leader of the party's 'Abolish the committee' drive.

"Several dozen other people, either party members, former party members, fellow travelers, or persons clearly under party influence, have also been named in this report as persons playing an active part in the San Francisco hearing agitation and rioting.

"Despite these facts, there are those who claim that the riots were not Communist-instigated. The committee believes

it will be apparent to all persons of average intelligence that, in making this claim, such persons are clearly flying in the face of all rules of evidence and common sense.

"The committee has stated before that all the rioters were not Communists and that most of them were dupes who were tricked into violating the law by clever, well-trained Communist agitators. While this is true, the committee also feels that the following fact needs emphasis.

"The great majority of the persons arrested in the course of the 3 days of the hearings in San Francisco are persons who would normally be considered adults and, therefore, fully responsible for their actions.

Many people have the mistaken impression that most of these people were extremely young. This is not true. Of the 70 persons arrested, 65 were non-juveniles. Their age breakdown is as follows:

"4 were over 35 years of age;

"4 were between 30-35 years of age;

"13 were 25-29 years of age;

"7 were 24 years old;

"10 were 23 years old;

"11 were 21 and 22 years of age;

"16 between 18 and 20 years of age.

"In other words, 38 of the arrestees -- more than half of them -- were above normal college age, that is, 23 years

of age or over.

"It is worth noting, too, that after Judge Axelrod had dismissed charges against all of the arrestees except Meisenbach, 56 of them issued a statement (which had been prepared in advance) saying:

"Nobody incited us, nobody misguided us. We were led only by our own convictions, and we still stand firmly by them.

"There can be no doubt but that this statement was true as it applied to veteran Communist Vernon Brown, party youth leader Douglas Wachter, and a few other signers. The committee believes, however, that it is not true as far as other signers who are completely innocent of any Communist affiliation or sympathy are concerned.

"On July 20, 1960, the San Francisco Examiner, in an editorial on J. Edgar Hoover's report on the riots, pinpointed the problem presented by the innocent signers of this statement and other persons in this country who are unwittingly used by agents of the Kremlin to do its work:

"The report by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover on the Communist inspired City Hall riot of students May 13 is a typical case history of Communist methods in manipulating the innocent. Those familiar with Communist techniques won't find in the report a single new Communist device. The methods have been used thousands of times in this country

and around the world.

"Yet, old as they are, the methods worked again at City Hall -- worked so successfully that even today, after Hoover's report, we imagine most of the student rioters are arguing, in all sincerity, that they were not duped, and that the FBI is mistaken.

"Why do the old tactics still work in a country that is supposedly armed by knowledge against Communists' ways?"

\* \* \* \* \*

"Answering the question posed above, we don't think that many citizens, particularly younger people, are armed with knowledge against Communist methods. A whole generation has passed since the depression days when the Communists tried to seize the labor movement and other groups, and fomented so much violence that most Americans came to recognize their spoor readily.

"Perhaps we have forgotten that every generation must be taught anew the ways of this enemy. Not just taught the truth about Communism as an ideology and political force, but taught how to recognize Communist conspirators in action."

Mr. Chairman, this pamphlet is an answer to anyone who says that Operation Abolition was untrue and was incorrect. This pamphlet is an authentic document of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, and I wanted the record to show

the facts concerning what the House Committee on Un-American Activities had to say about this film Operation Abolition.

Senator Stennis. Thank you, Senator.

Senator Bartlett. Mr. Chairman.

Senator Stennis. Senator Bartlett.

Senator Bartlett. Some time ago during these hearings a witness whose name I don't remember at the moment mentioned Fabian Socialism, and I asked him to define it and he did.

Apparently this was published in England and subsequently I received a letter from an officer of the Fabian Society, I think it was the Secretary, rather strongly denying any association between that society and communism. I ask permission to place that letter in the record of the hearings.

Senator Stennis. All right, Senator.

Senator Bartlett. I am reminded it was General Trudeau.

Senator Stennis. All right, Mr. Reporter, you will insert the letter here at this place in the record.

(The letter referred to follows:)

COMMITTEE INSERT

Senator Stennis. Are there any other questions to ask General Walker?

(No response.)

Senator Stennis. General Walker, do you have anything further that comes to mind?

Mr. Walker. Nothing further, except to thank the Committee for this opportunity. I appreciate it and appreciate the manner in which it has been carried out.

Thank you very much.

Senator Stennis. Thank you, General. I want to say the Committee certainly appreciates your appearance here, the work that you have gone into in getting up your statement, the preparation you have made to be able to respond to questions. We appreciate your having these gentlemen here with you that assisted you.

Senator Thurmond. Mr. Chairman, could I say just a word?

Senator Stennis. Yes, Senator Thurmond.

Senator Thurmond. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that while I may not agree with General Walker on all of his statements, he has been a great soldier. He has served for over 30 years in the American Army, and he is now retired without any compensation whatsoever. He is a great American, and I want to say this:

That some people who may not agree with his testimony have one reason or another, but General Walker understands the

Approved For Release 2004/02/03 : CIA-RDP64B00346R000100210016-5

international conspiracy of communism. Possibly he hasn't expressed it in verbiage that some would have, or possibly he hasn't brought out in every detail the points that maybe he should have brought out.

I did not confer with General Walker prior to his statement or in the preparation of it. I had nothing to do with it. I am not his defender. But as one American citizen to another, I want to commend him for his tremendous service to his country, for his great patriotism and for his knowledge and his cognizance of this international conspiracy of communism and the danger that it poses to the United States and to the free world.

Mr. Walker. I thank you, sir.

Senator Bartlett. Mr. Chairman, may I merely say that there can be no doubt whatsoever that General Walker is a dedicated American.

Mr. Walker. Thank you, sir.

Senator Stennis. Gentlemen, I had never heard that question raised. I don't think there is any doubt about that, and the General's career as a soldier is very great.

I think of him in terms of what I call a Field General, a General of the Army out with the men, where he made a fine impression as the Chair understands, not only as Commander of this 24th Division, but prior thereto and on the field of battle.

We thank you, too, for your appearance here, for your preparation in coming here and for the aides that are with you, and the Committee will remain in session now, but with the thanks of the Committee again, General Walker, you are excused.

Mr. Walker. Thank you, sir.

(Whereupon, at 11:45 o'clock a.m., the Committee adjourned, to reconvene at 10:00 o'clock a.m., Friday, April 6, 1962.)

- - -



STAT

said nothing too important in this.

Has clipped where CIA is mentioned. J.